DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 852 EA 020 637

AUTHOR DeFigio, Nicholas; Zigmond, Naomi
TITLE Using a Needs Assessment Instrument To Evaluate the Impact of a Staff Development Program on the Role and Function of the Principal.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Responsibility; Administrator Role; Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Development; *Needs Assessment; Personnel Needs; *Principals; *School Districts; School Surveys; *Staff Development; Teacher Role; *Urban Education; *Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

Data from needs assessment surveys administered to building level administrators, supervisors, and classroom teachers in a large urban school district (42,000 students) before and after a major staff development initiative were analyzed. The primary focus of this study is the impact of the training effort on participants' perceptions of district needs, particularly its effect on the role and function of building administrators. The analyses showed that there had been considerable change in the perceptions of needs in the district related to curriculum and instruction, testing, and personnel evaluation. Changes were not seen, however, in the areas of staff development/inservice or in the definition of administrator and supervisor roles and responsibilities. Seven tables concerning changes in perception are appended. (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED303852

USING A NEEDS ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT TO EVALUATE THE IMPACT OF A STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM ON THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE PRINCIPAL

Nicholas DeFigio & Naomi Zigmond
Institute for Practice & Research in Education
School of Education
University of Pittsburgh

EA 020 637

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. DeFigio

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

USING A NEEDS ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT TO EVALUATING THE IMPACT OF A STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM ON THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE PRINCIPAL

Introduction

Increasingly, school districts are mounting efforts to improve instructional delivery and student achievement. There is also a demand for more effective schools from public figures, the media, and the profession itself. These demands for school improvement bring pressure on the profession in general and school districts in particular. Because of this, districts are mounting elaborate and expensive staff development efforts aimed at improving the performance of all school personnel, from teachers to administrators. All too often these staff development programs are implemented with little thought as to how growth or change will be measured. District resources are invested in the training programs themselves; few resources are allocated to evaluating outcomes.

The current study involved the use of an existing data base to provide indirect evidence of the impact of a staff development program. Data from needs assessment surveys administered to building level administrators, supervisors and classroom teachers in a large urban school district before and after a major staff development initiative were analyzed to evaluate the impact of the training effort on participants' perceptions of district needs. The first administration of the needs assessment survey occurred in 1980, the second administration of a similar needs assessment survey occurred in 1986. Changes in those items on the survey that related to curriculum, testing, staff development, personnel evaluation and personnel

roles were used as indicators of the effects of the staff development effort.

Recent research efforts in evaluating staff development initiatives have focused on documenting changes in teacher behaviors or student achievement (see Stallings, 1984). Because many staff development efforts begin with inservice for principals, helping them to become instructional leaders as well as more effective building managers, particular attention was paid in this study to indication of changes in the role of the principal. Principals have been recognized as key players in the process of changing teachers' behaviors and improving achievement (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986). Yet, few studies have been undertaken to evaluate changes in the role and functioning of the principal, in part because of the difficulties in defining appropriate outcome measures. One purpose of this research was to analyze systematically the two needs assessment surveys to evaluate changes in the perceptions of district needs by various constituencies as they might relate to changes in the role of building administrators.

Methods and Data Source

The data for this investigation came from a large urban school district of 42,000 students. Data were generated from needs assessment surveys administered to a random selection of building administrators, supervisors and teachers in 1980 (n = 163) and in 1986 (n = 264).

The needs assessment surveys used in this research were implemented to help the Board of Education establish goals and expectations in order to set priorities for the district. The processes used to construct the instruments and conduct the surveys gave the professional staff, administration, and the community the opportunity to participate in

activities that resulted in goal generation and goal setting which in turn served as the basis for decision making. The process secured a firm commitment from the Board to pursue goals and set priorities. It also set the stage for a rigorous and long term staff development effort that continues to operate.

The needs assessments were designed to provide the superintendent and the school board with a data base from which to set priorities for the district. Several different surveys were developed in 1980 so that each target group could be asked questions on district problems and needs that were particularly relevant. The same surveys (with some new questions added) were readministered six years later.

The first administration of the needs assessment surveys occurred in 1980; 62 building administrators, 26 supervisors, and 75 teachers completed the questionnaire. The second administration occurred in 1986; 99 building administrators, 21 supervisors, and 144 teachers completed the surveys. In the needs assessments administered to building administrators, 73 items appeared on both surveys, organized into 11 categories: Fiscal Resources, Facilities, Personnel, Instruction, Instructional Leader, Communication and Coordination, Testing, Students, Transportation, Extra-curricular, and Parent Relationships. The Supervisor and Teacher surveys each contained 55 common items organized into the same categories.

Both the 1980 and the 1986 needs assessment surveys consisted of Likert scaled items from which respondents chose answers of 'strongly disagree,' 'disagree,' 'undecided,' 'agree,' and 'strongly agree.' Respondents could also choose a 'not applicable' answer. For the current analysis, responses of 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree' were combined, as were responses of

'agree' and 'strongly agree.' Responses of 'not applicable' were omitted. Each question that appeared on both the 1980 and the 1986 surveys was reviewed to determine which items would reflect the content and aims of the staff development initiative (Wallace, Young, Johnston, LeMahieu & Bickel, 1985) and which were uniquely related to the role of the effective principal (Edmonds, R. 1979, Persell & Crookson, 1982; Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986). Selection of items was done independently by each of the principal investigators and by a central staff person very knowlegeable about the purpose of the staff development program and the development of the needs assessment instruments. The process identified 25 items on the Principals' survey, 18 items on the Supervisors' survey and 17 on the Teachers' survey. Changes in the distribution of responses on these items across the three answers (agree, undecided and disagree) were compared for the two administrations of each survey using Chi Square analyses.

Description of the Staff Development Program

Staff development in this district was organized to introduce a shared professional language and a system-wide approach to classroom instruction, improve classroom instruction, support instructional leadership, develop a process for personnel evaluation, and stimulate professional growth (Mensinger, 1986).

All teachers and administrators in the school district participated in the staff development program. During the first year principals and supervisors received 30 hours of training that included an "update in the principles of effective teaching, observation skills, analysis and feedback skills. During and after the training period administrators observed, held

conferences and taught staff development concepts to teachers", (Stoeckinger, 1984).

In 1982-83 the principals and supervisors, with the help of a small group of teachers, trained other teachers. By the end of the 1982-83 school year, all personnel had been exposed to the staff development concepts. The focus was on "knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are prerequisite to effective educational leadership" (Wallace, 1982).

The third phase, a center for secondary school teachers, provided a clinical experience for all high school teachers in the district. The purpose was to give each teacher the opportunity "(1) to observe instructional activities in a real setting; (2) to practice new skills and techniques; (3) to receive feedback on that practice; (4) to translate theory into practice; and (5) to recieve an update in their specific subject matter areas, latest research finding in effective teaching technology, and appropriate areas in psychology" (Wallace, 1982). Centers at the middle and elementary schools were to follow the development of the secondary school center. District personnel are presently engaged in center activities.

Results

Analyses of the needs assessment data were carried out for surveys completed by administrators, supervisors and teachers. The results of these analyses are reported separately. Then, data from the three sources were compared for supporting evidence of changes in the role of the role and responsibility of building administrators.

Changes of Perceptions of Principals. Table 1 summarizes the findings on principals' perceptions of change on the 25 survey items which related to the staff development initiative. The letter in brackets at the

end of the item descriptor classifies the item as related to curriculum and instruction (C), testing (T), staff development or inservice (SD), personnel evaluation (E) or personnel role (R). On 12 of the 25 items (48%), there were significant shifts in the perceptions of the principals, indicating perceptions of significant improvements. Of the remaining 13 items, seven (28%) were considered problems in 1980 and continued to be considered problems in 1986, five (20%) were not considered serious problems either in 1980 or in 1986, and one item, related to testing, showed a perception of a significant worsening of conditions, from not perceived as a problem in 1980 to perceived as a problem in 1986.

Of the 19 items that were considered problems by more the 40% of the building administrators in the 1980 survey (the first three portions of Table 1), two items related to curriculum and instruction, five items related to testing, five items related to staff development or inservice, three related to personnel evaluation, and four related to the role and responsibilities of the principal. On one curriculum item (50%), four testing items (80%) and four staff development/inservice items (80%), three personnel evaluation items (100%) and one personnel role item (25%) there were significant improvements.

Changes in perceptions of supervisors. Of the 55 items on the Supervisors/Associate Directors needs assessment questionnaire, 18 were considered to be related to the expectations of the staff development effort. Table 2 summarizes the changes in perceptions of supervisors on these items. On seven of the 18 items (38.8%), there were significant shifts in the perceptions of the Supervisors indicating perceptions of significant improvements. Of the remaining 11 items, three (16.6%) were

considered problems in 1980 and continued to be considered problems in 1986, five (27.7%) were considered serious problems in both 1980 and in 1986, one item was not a problem in either 1980 or 1986, and two items showed a perception of a significant worsening of conditions, from not perceived as a problem in 1980 to perceived as a problem in 1986.

Of the 15 items that were considered problems by more than 40% of the Supervisor in the 1980 survey (the first three portions of Table 2), three items related to curriculum and instruction, eight items related to staff development and inservice, one to evaluation of professional staff, and three to the role and responsibilities of the Supervisor. On two curriculum items (67%), five staff development/inservice items (62.5%), the personnel evaluation item (100%), and two personnel roles items (67%) there were significant improvements.

Changes in perceptions of teachers. Of the 55 items on the Teachers needs assessment questionnaire, 17 were considered to be related to the expectations of the staff development effort. On 13 of the 17 items (76%) there were significant shifts in the perceptions of the Teachers indicating perceptions of significant improvements. The remaining four items were not considered serious problems in either 1980 or 1986. A summary of these results is found in Table 3.

Of the 13 items that were considered problems by more than 40% of the Teachers in the 1980 survey (the first portion of Table 3), three items related to curriculum and instruction, two items related to testing, five to staff development/inservice, and three to personnel roles. On all of these items there were significant improvements.

Comparison across the three respondent groups. Table 4 presents a compilation of the 19 items from the building administrators' survey, the 15 items from the Supervisors' survey and the 13 items from the Teachers' survey that were of serious concern in 1980 to more than 40% of each respondent group. The resulting 34 items are organized by category. The notations in one or more of the three columns on the right indicate the source of the item, since most items did not appear on more than one survey. Each item on which there were significant changes in perceptions such that it was no longer a problem is marked *No Problem*. Items which changed significantly but are still a problem are designated *Still Problem*. Items on which there were no significant changes are designated *No Change*.

In general, respondents perceived that significant improvements had been made in curricular areas. All agreed that there had been a significant improvements in the definition of a "core of basic skill." On only two of the six curriculum items were there no significant changes: principals were still concerned about a lack of techniques for helping below average pupils, and supervisors still perceived a lack of clarity in system wide goals.

For supervisors, testing items had not been rated as significant problems. Teachers and administrators agreed, however, that there had been significant improvements in identifying a testing program that reflected what was taught and that provided evaluative data on which to base educational discussion. Only one of the five testing items remained unchanged: principals' concern that the public misinterpreted published test data about their schools.

Eleven staff development issues appeared on at least one survey, and five were still a problem for more than 40% of supervisors. All three

groups agreed on improvements in time for building level inservice. While teachers believed there had been a significant decrease in teacher burnout, more than 40% of administrators and supervisors still believed this to be a problem.

On the three items related to personnel evaluation, there were significant improvements. Significantly fewer principals and supervisors reported problems in defining criteria for personnel evalautions.

In terms of the roles and responsibilities of building administrators, teachers no longer viewed instructional leadership, meaningful assistance or dialogue to be problems. Supervisors believed that there was no longer ambiguity in who was to serve as the building level instructional leader although they were still unclear about their own roles. However, building principals considered all four items on their questionnaire related to role definition to be continuing problems. More than 40% of the administrator respondents were still concerned about the lack of time to visit classrooms, the unclear role of the supervisor, and the distracting demands on the administrator's time.

Discussion

The primary focus of this study was to try to determine the effects of an intense and long term staff development program, in particular its effects on the role and function of building administrators, by identifying changes in responses to survey items that were related to district-wide staff development efforts. The analyses showed that, over the six year period between the two administrations of the needs assessments, there had been considerable changes in the perceptions of needs in the district related to curriculum and instruction, testing and personnel evaluation.

While changes in perceptions cannot be directly attributed to the staff development efforts of the district, the data analyzed in this study indicated that the efforts expended to date have produced some very positive results and have alleviated many of the most critical problems perceived by district personnel at the start of the staff development initiative.

Changes were not seen, however, in the areas of staff development/inservice or in the definition of administrator and supervisor roles and responsibilities. Only about half of the staff development concerns identified in 1980 were perceived to be problems by significantly fewer respondents in 1986. Supervisors, in particular, continued to perceive problems in teacher burnout, lack of adequate training for teachers or supervisors when innovations are introduced into the schools, lack of opportunities for grade level specific inservices, lack of resources to encourage professional development of instructional staffs, and not enough inservice days. Of course, there were improvements in staff development concerns reported by some constituents: Teachers found significant improvements in time for building level inservice, in teacher involvement in planning inservice, in the extent of teacher burnout, in accessing training for implementing district innovations, and in the overall quality of the inservice training offered them. Principals saw improvements in the relevance of inservice programs, in the adequacy of the numbers of inservice opportunities and in the quality of inservice offerings. But overall, staff development concerns must still be on the district's change agenda.

Only some of the problems with defining roles and responsibilities were alleviated during the six years of staff development. Teachers and supervisors had no continuing problems with role definition. Teachers, by

1986, were no longer concerned about instructional leadership in their buildings, about getting meaningful assistance from supervisory personnel, or about establishing building level dialogues among administrators and faculty to set educational goals. Supervisors saw significant improvements in the definition of the building instructional leader and in their access to superiors to discuss concerns and recommendations. In contrast, however, principals continued to have concerns over the role and function of the supervisor, over time for principals and instructional chairs to visit classrooms, and over the distracting demands placed on administrators' time. These data suggest that the staff development program did nothing to alleviate the concerns of principals over their own roles in their buildings.

Since the completion of this study the superintendent has shared these data, expecially Table 1, with the school board, administrators, the school community and other interested groups. He found the organization of the summary tables useful, convenient, and easy to understand.

The current study shows that these same needs assessment data can be used as indirect evidence of the accomplishments of that staff development initiative and of persistent problems, not corrected by the staff development activities, to which the district might now direct its attention.

Table 1

Changes in Perceptions of Principals From 1980 to 1986

Characterization	Statement	Survey Results : % Agree 1980	1986	Dif
A problem to 40% of principals in 1980 significant change by 1986; no longer a problem	- Lack of systemwide "core of skills" in each subject area which would serve as the basis for instruction and criterion for mastery (C)	75.8%	35.4%	40.2%
	- Lack of standardized districtwide testing program that meets my evaluation needs (T)	46.5%	14.0%	32.5%
	- Lack of a standardized testing program that reflects well what is being taught in my school (T)	65.0%	23.9%	41.1%
	- Too much "lag time" between administration of standardized tests and reporting of results (T)	83.0%	37.3%	45.7%
	- Lack of availability of relevant, comprehensive and accurate evaluation information to provide the basis for educational decisions (T)	73.6%	13.9%	59.7%
	- Poor quality of current inservice programming (SD)	44.0%	8.6%	35.4%
	- Lack of relevance of current inservice programming to my building's needs (SD)	55.9%	17.2%	38.7%
	- Lack of opportunity for building level "inservices" (SD)	73.3%	17.2%	56.1%
	- Lack of adequate numbers of districtwide inservices (SD)	57.6%	31.9%	25.7%
	- Lack of systemwide expections regarding instructional responsibilities of teachers (E)	79.6%	23.4%	56.2%
	- Lack of good criteria by which to evaluate teacher instructional effectiveness (E)	78.9%	8.7%	70.2%
	- Lack of definitive system for evaluating the performance of teachers and other professional staff (E)	64.4%	16.1%	48.3%
A problem in 1980; significant change; still a problem	- Lack of sufficient opportunity for instructional chairpersons to visit classrooms in my building (R)	68.1%	42.4%	25.7%
A problem in 1980; no change; still a problem	- Lack of instructional techniques for helping below average pupils (C)	59.0%	55.0%	4.0%
	- Public misinterpretation of published test score data about my school (T)	51.0%	57.0%	+6.0%

Table 1 (Con't)

Changes in Perceptions of Principals From 1980 to 1986

Characterization	Statement	Survey Results : % Agree 1980	1986	Dif
	- The unclear definition of the general role and function of a supervisor in the system (R)	55.0%	47.0%	8.0%
	- Too many distracting demands on my time (R)	88.0%	86.0%	2.0%
	- Inadequate time to spend in classrooms supervising instruction (R)	86.0%	79.0%	7.0%
	- Teacher burnout (SD)	47.0%	45.0%	2.0%
Not a problem in 1980; no change; still not a problem	- Results of standardized achievement tests are not presented and interpreted in a meaningful and useful way to teachers and other involved in the instructional process (T)	40.0%	27.0%	13.0%
	- Lack of clear definition as to which person(s) or group(s) are to serve as instructional leader at the building level (R)	26.0%	13.0%	13.0%
	- Lack of adequate communication between central administrative staff and my building (R)	38.0%	34.0%	14.0%
	- Supervisors and staff who lack adequate training (SD)	25.0%	18.0%	13.0%
	- Low staff morale in this building (SD)	15.0%	15.0%	0.0%
Not a problem in 1980; significant change; now a problem	- Too much teacher and student time being spent on standardized testing (T)	33.3%	44.4%	+11.1%

Table 2

Changes in Perceptions of Supervisors from 1980 to 1986

Characterization		Statement	Survey Results : % Agree 1980	1986	Dif
A problem to 40% of supervisors in 1980; significant change by 1986; no longer a problem	-	The lack of a system-wide basic "core of skills" in each subject area which would serve both as the basis for student instruction and criterion for mastery. (C)	65.4%	33.3%	32.1%
	-	There is no coordination of instruction across levels of schooling (i.e. from elementary to middle to secondary). (C)	77.0%	0.0%	77.0%
	-	Lack of specific staff development programs for supervisors and/or associate directors in order to assist them in obtaining the necessary skills and techniques for working with instructional staff. (SD)	80.8%	19.0%	61.8%
	-	Lack of opportunity to conduct inservice programs that focus on building level rather than on district-wide needs. (SD)	50.0%	33.4%	16.6%
	-	Lack of direct access to superiors to present concerns, recommendations etc. (R)	69.2%	4.6%	64.6%
	-	Lack of clear definition as to which person(s) or group(s) are to serve as instructional leader(s) at the building level. (R)	64.5%	28.6%	35.9%
	-	Lack of definitive system for evaluating the performance of professional staff. (E)	53.9%	33.3%	20.6%
A problem in 1980; significant change; still a problem	-	Lack of opportunity to conduct inservice programs that focus on grade level programs (SD)	42.3%	61.9%	+19.6%
	-	Inadequate teacher training when educational innovations and new curricula are introduced. (SD)	84.6%	52.4%	32.2%
	-	Lack of opportunity/resources to encourage the professional development of instructional staff. (SD)	57.7%	42.8%	14.9%
A problem in 1980; no change; still a problem.	-	Lack of clarity of system-wide objectives or yearly goals. (C)	57.7%	61.9%	+4.2%
	-	Not enough inservice days for teachers to improve instructional techniques, make materials, exchange information, etc. (SD)	80.7%	71.5%	9.2%

Table 2 (Con't)

Changes in Perceptions of Supervisors From 1980 to 1986

Characterization	Statement	Survey Results : % Agree 1980	1986	Dif
	- Lack of information and/or training for supervisors when innovations are introduced into the schools. (SD)	65.4%	56.7%	8.7%
	- Teacher burnout (SD)	80.7%	76.7%	4.0%
	- The unclear definition of the general role and function of a supervisor in the system and the lack of a specific job description for each type of supervisory position. (R)	69.3%	57.2%	12.1%
Not a problem in 1980; no change; still not a problem.	- The administration of standardized achievement tests takes up too much teacher and student time. (T)	7.6%	23.8%	+16.2%
Not a problem in 1980; significant change; now a problem	- Unwillingness of the building administrator to work with the supervisor in developing and carrying out plans for instructional improvement. (R)	34.6%	42.8%	+8.2%
	- Results of standardized achievement tests are not not presented and interpreted in a meaningful and useful way to teachers and other involved in the instructional process. (T)	31.6%	76.2%	+44.6%

Table 3

Changes in Perceptions of Teachers From 1980 to 1986

Characterization	Statement	Survey Results : % Agree 1980	1986	Dif
A problem to 40% or more of teachers in 1980; significant change by 1986; no longer a problem.	- The lack of student achievement in reading writing and mathematics. (C)	65.3%	27.1%	38.2%
	- A lack of systemwide basic "core of skills" in each subject area which would serve both as the basis for student instruction and criterion for mastery. (C)	62.7%	13.9%	48.8%
	- The lack of articulation and agreement among the curricular goals of the various grade levels. (C)	53.3%	35.4%	17.9%
	- That standardized tests are poorly matched to what I teach. (T)	41.3%	16.7%	24.6%
	- Lack of availability of relevant, comprehensive and accurate evaluation information to provide the basis for educational decisions. (T)	46.0%	12.5%	33.5%
	- The lack of building level inservice time. (SD)	61.3%	10.4%	50.9%
	- The fact that teachers do not plan their own inservice. (SD)	70.7%	24.3%	46.4%
	- Teacher burn-out. (SD)	65.3%	30.6%	34.7%
	- A lack of information and/or training when innovations are introduced into the schools. (SD)	62.7%	29.8%	32.9%
	- The poor quality of inservices. (SD)	70.6%	36.8%	33.8%
	- A lack of instructional leadership on the part of building administrators. (R)	40.0%	22.2%	17.8%
	- A lack of meaningful assistance from central supervisory personnel. (R)	46.7%	22.2%	24.5%
	- The lack of dialogue among faculty and administrators in setting educational goals of the schools. (R)	66.7%	37.6%	29.1%

Table 3 (con't)

Changes in Perceptions of Teachers From 1980 to 1986

Characterization	Statement	Survey Results : % Agree 1980	1986	Dif
Not a problem in 1980; no change; still a problem.	- The lack of emphasis placed upon teacher constructed tests to increase student academic concentration and performance. (T)	21.4%	6.3%	15.1%
	- That teachers do not have high enough expectations for their students. (SD)	37.3%	10.4%	26.9%
	- That I do not feel adequately trained for my assignment. (SD)	2.7%	5.6%	+2.9%
	- A lack of a clear definition as to which person(s) are to serve as instructional leader(s) at the building level. (R)	25.3%	13.9%	11.4%

Table 4

Comparisons Across Respondent Groups and Across Item Categories

Survey Items by Category	Survey Results		
	Administrator	Supervisor	Teacher
Curriculum and Instruction			
- Lack of systemwide basic "core of skills" in each subject area which would serve both as the basis for student instruction and criterion mastery.	No Problem	No Problem	No Problem
- There is no coordination of instruction across levels of schooling (i.e., from elementary to middle to secondary).		No Problem	
- The lack of student achievement in reading, writing and mathematics.			No Problem
- The lack of articulation and agreement among the curricular goals of the various grade levels.			No Problem
- Lack of instructional techniques for helping below average pupils.	No Change		
- Lack of clarity of system-wide objectives or yearly goals.		No Change	
Testing			
- Lack of standardized districtwide testing program that meets my evaluation needs.	No Problem		
- Lack of a standardized testing program that reflects well what is being taught in my school.	No Problem		No Problem
- Too much "lag" time between administration of standardized tests and reporting results.	No Problem		
- Lack of availability or relevant, comprehensive and accurate evaluation information to provide the basis for educational decisions.	No Problem		No Problem
- Public misinterpretation of published test score data about my school.	No Change		
- Too much teacher and student time spent on standardized testing	Worse		
- Results of standardized achievement tests not presented and interpreted in a meaningful and useful way to teachers and othrers inviolved in the instructional process		Worse	

Table 4 (continued)

Comparisons Across Respondent Groups and Across Item Categories

Survey Items by Category	Survey Results: Administrator	Supervisor	Teacher
Staff Development/Inservice			
- Lack of relevance of current inservice programming to my building needs	No Problem		
- Lack of specific staff development programs for supervisors and/or associate directors ion order to assist them in obtaining the necessary skills and techniques for working with instructional staff.		No Problem	
- Lack of adequate numbers of districtwide inservices	No Problem		
- Lack of building level inservice time.	No Problem	No Problem	No Problem
- The fact that teachers do not plan their own inservice.			No Problem
- Teacher burn-out.	No Change	No Change	No Problem
- A lack of information and/or training for teachers when innovations are introduced into the schools.		No Change	No Problem
- A lack of information and/or training for supervisors when innovations are introduced into the schools.		No Change	
- The poor quality of inservices.	No Problem		No Problem
- Lack of opportunity to conduct inservice programs that focus on grade level programs.		Still Problem	
- Lack of opportunity/resources to encourage the professional development of instructional staff.		Still Problem	
- Not enough inservice days for teachers to improve instructional techniques, make materials, exchange information, etc.		No Change	
Personnel Evaluation			
- Lack of systemwide expectations regarding instructional responsibilities of teachers.	No Problem		
- Lack of good criteria by which to evaluate teacher instructional effectiveness.	No Problem		
- Lack of definitive system for evaluating the performance of professional staff.	No Problem	No Problem	

Table 4 (continued)

Comparisons Across Respondent Groups and Across Item Categories

Survey Items by Category	Survey Results: Administrator	Supervisor	Teacher
Roles & Responsibilities			
- Lack of sufficient opportunity for instructional chairpersons to visit classrooms in my building.	Still Problem		
- Lack of direct access to superiors to present concerns, recommendations, etc.		No Problem	
- Lack of clear definitions as to which person(s) or group(s) are to serve as instructional leader(s) at the building level.		No Problem	
- The lack of dialogue among faculty and administrators in setting educational goals of the schools.			No Problem
- A lack of instructional leadership on the part of building administrators.			No Problem
- A lack of meaningful assistance from central supervisory personnel.			No Problem
- The unclear definition of the general role and function of a supervisor in the system.	No Change	No Change	
- Too many distracting demands on my time.	No Change		
- Inadequate time to spend in classrooms supervising instruction.	No Change		

Table 5

Similar Items Across the Three Surveys

Characterization	Survey Results 1980	1986	Dif
BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS			
38. Lack of system-wide "core of skills" in each subject area which would serve as the basis for instruction and criterion for mastery.	75.8%	35.4%	40.4%
61. Lack of relevance of current inservice programming to my building's needs.	55.9%	17.2%	38.7%
23. Lack of definitive system for evaluating the performance of teachers and other professional staff.	64.4%	16.1%	48.3%
50. Lack of clear definition as to which person(s) or group(s) are to serve as instructional leader at the building level.	26.0%	13.0%	13.0%
SUPERVISORS/ASSOCIATE DIRECTORS			
60. The lack of a system-wide basic "core of skills" in each subject area which would serve both as the basis for student instruction and criterion for mastery.	65.4%	33.3%	32.1%
22. Lack of opportunity to conduct inservice programs that focus on building level rather than on districtwide needs.	50.0%	33.4%	16.6%
14. Lack of definitive system for evaluating the performance of professional staff.	53.9%	33.3%	20.6%
3. Lack of clear definition as to which person(s) or group(s) are to serve as are to serve as instructional leader(s) atthe building level.	65.4%	28.6%	36.8%
TEACHERS			
46. A lack of system-wide basic "cor of skills" in each subject area which would serve both as the bais for student instruction and criterion for mastery.	62.7%	13.9%	48.8%
58. The lack of building level inservice time.	51.3%	10.4%	50.9%
47. Lack of availability of relevant, comprehensive and accurate evaluation information to provide the basis for educational decisions.	46.0%	12.5%	33.5%
44. A lack of a clear definition as to which person(s) are to serve as instructional leader(s) at the building level.	25.3%	13.9%	11.4%

Table 6

Items from Supervisor/Associate Directors Survey that Indicate Change/No Change in the Role of the Building Administrator

Characterization		Survey Results 1980	1986	Dif
3.	Lack of clear definition as to which person(s) or group(s) are to serve as instructional leader(s) at the building level.	65.4%	28.6%	36.8%
22.	Lack of opportunity to conduct inservice programs that focus on building level rather than on districtwide needs	50.0%	33.4%	16.6%
23.	Lack of opportunity to conduct inservice programs that focus on grade level programs.	42.3%	61.9%	+19.6%
66.	Lack of opportunity/resources to encourage the professional development of instructional staff.	57.7%	42.8%	14.9%
51.	Teacher burnout.	80.7%	76.7%	4.2%
20.	Unwillingness of the building administrator to work with the supervisor in developing and carrying out plans for instructional improvement.	34.6%	42.8%	+8.2%

Table 7

Items from Teachers Survey that Indicate Change/No Change in the Role of the Building Administrator

Characterization		Survey Results 1980	1986	Dif
2.	A lack of instructional leadership on the part of building administrators.	40.0%	22.2%	17.8%
47.	Lack of availability of relevant, comprehensive and accurate evaluation information to provide the basis for educational decisions.	46.0%	12.5%	33.5%
58.	The lack of building level inservice time.	61.3%	10.4%	50.9%
61.	Teacher burnout	65.3%	30.6%	34.7%
65.	The lack of dialogue among faculty and administrators in setting educational goals of the schools.	66.7%	37.6%	29.1%
80.	The lack of articulation and agreement among the curricular goals of the various grade levels.	53.3%	35.4%	17.9%
44.	A lack of a clear definition as to which person(s) are to serve as instructional leader(s) at the building level.	25.3%	13.9%	11.4%

REFERENCES

Blumberg & Greenfield (1986). The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 37, 15-24.

Messinger, J. L. (1986). Principal's perceptions of role during the implementation of organizational change. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA.

Persell, C. H. & Crookson, P. W. (1982). The effective principal in actions. In The effective principal: A research summary (pp. 22-29). Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Stallings, J. A. (1984). An evaluation of the NAPA Co. Office of Education Follow Through staff development effort to increase student learning time and achievement. Paper presented at annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Stoeckinger, M. (1984). PRISM Pittsburgh research based instrucational supervisory, brochure used by the Pittsburgh Public Schools, Pittsburgh, PA.

Wallace, R. C. (1982). PRISM: A staff development program. Unpublished paper used locally and for visitors to the District.

Wallace, R. C., Young, J., Johnston, J., LeMahieu, P. & Bickel, W. (1984). Schenley High School Teacher Center: Secondary Education Renewal in Pittsburgh. Educational Leadership, 41, 73-77.